

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/757,876 | 01/14/2004 | Jonathan A. Selzer | 25614-04A | 5182 |
| John L. Cordan | 7590 01/30/2007 ni, Esq. | EXAMINER | | |
| Carmody & Torrance LLP P.O. Box 1110 50 Leavenworth Street Waterbury, CT 06721-1110 | | | MI, QIUWEN | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1655 | |
| | | | | |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MONTHS | | 01/30/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Comment | 10/757,876 | SELZER ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| • | Qiuwen Mi | 1655 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | | · | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 De | ecember 2006. | | | | | |
| , , | <u>_</u> | | | | | |
| , | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | m nom consideration. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected. | | · | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement | | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | · | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to: See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | nte | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's argument on 12/14/2006 concerning the Yoon reference is noted, thus the rejection concerning Yoon is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 USC § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Kharebava et al (SU 1792627).

Kharebava et al teach a drink comprising 0.3-0.9% (about 1%) green tea, *Stevia* and ascorbic acid (vitamin) that reads on claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, and 9. The product does not contain sucrose, which reads on "free of sucrose" in claims 3 and 7.

Thus, the invention is anticipated over the reference.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/757,876

Art Unit: 1655

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kharebava et al (SU 1792627) in view of Li (CN 1086091A).

As discussed above, Kharebava et al teach a drink comprising green tea (0.3-0.9%, about 1%), *Stevia*, and ascorbic acid (vitamin).

Li teaches a tea bag product (a drink) comprising licorice roots that are Chinese herbal medicine (Chinese licorice roots).

It is well known that it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two or more ingredients each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose in order to form a third composition which is useful for the same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. *In re Sussman*, 1943 C.D. 518; *In re Pinten*, 459 F.2d 1053, 173 USPQ 801 (CCPA 1972); *In re Susi*, 58 CCPA 1074, 1079-80; 440 F.2d 442, 445; 169 USPQ 423, 426 (1971); *In re Crockett*, 47 CCPA 1018, 1020-21; 279 F.2d 274, 276-277; 126 USPQ 186, 188 (1960).

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chinese licorice roots in Li with the green tea, *Stevia*, and ascorbic acid in Kharebava et al since both teach using the ingredients in a drink and both of the products yielded beneficial results individually in the art, one of ordinary skill in the

art would have been motivated to make the modifications. The result-effective adjustment in conventional working parameters (e.g., determining the concentration of the components within the composition) is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization that is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Thus, the invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qiuwen Mi whose telephone number is 571-272-5984. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry Mckelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/757,876 Page 5

Art Unit: 1655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MICHAEL MELLER PRIMARY EXAMINER